PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT

OF

AID TRAINING PROGRAMS

STATUS REPORT I

DECEMBER 1970

Office of International Training
Agency for International Development
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20523

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT
OF
A.I.D. TRAINING PROGRAMS

Status Report 1

December 1970

INTRODUCTION

This First Status Report on Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs was prepared under Contract No. AID/csd-2865 by The American University Development Education and Training Research Institute (DETRI). The findings and conclusions, of course, are those of the contractor.

In providing a "status" report, rather than an annual report, we are embarking on a new method and form of reporting. In the past DETRI has prepared an annual report of the participants' assessment of their training programs. The 1st Annual Report was issued in May 1969, and the 2nd Annual Report, in July 1970. These were designed to present comprehensive findings on participants' reactions to many different aspects of their training experiences. They were widely distributed to many different types of audiences involved with A.I.D. participants.

While the data obtained were processed automatically, it still took a very long time to analyze, interpret and report on the experiences of participants who had been interviewed more than twelve months earlier. DETRI's data have accumulated for over three years and are now stored and are retrievable from a computerized data bank. It is now possible to prepare a wider variety of reports designed to be more useful to special reader audiences. These will include special profiles for USAIDs, participating agencies, major training institutions and others concerned with the programming of participants, as well as OIT management.

This first status report is intended for use primarily by AID/Washington and provides information on participants interviewed as recently as six months ago. The second status report will cut the "lag time" down to about

four months or less. Subsequent status reports will be distributed every four months so that users of DETRI reports may keep current. Three status reports each fiscal year will replace the annual report. These status reports will also compare the aggregate data from the period covered with the responses of A.I.D. participants from previous reports. Trends and changes will thus become more apparent.

Attached is a copy of the First Status Report. It contains data from participants interviewed between July 1, 1969 and June 30, 1970 and compares them with those who were interviewed between September 1, 1968 and June 30, 1969. Readers interested only in the most significant changes in participant reactions will find these listed under "Change Highlights." All findings in this report can be checked against the statistical tables beginning in the back of the report. This was done to provide a continuous narrative without interruption from displays of data. For those who wish more detail than the narrative provides, the tables are still available.

The U. S. Government has a large investment in this international training program. It is again gratifying to know how things are going, and to be able to say -- they are going very well.

Robert E. Matteson
Director
Office of International Training

December 1970

PREFACE

The DETRI status report series is intended primarily for use by AID/Washington. The purpose of these status reports is to provide reliable and valid information on training experiences as perceived and evaluated by the participants, and to monitor changes and trends in participant reactions. Other types of reports ("profiles" and special reports) will be issued from time to time and will be of greater interest to other readers such as USAIDs, participating agencies and major training institutions.

Status reports will be prepared every 4 months and will appear in April, August, and December. The reports will present responses of participants for the 4-month period being covered on selected items from the exit interview questionnaires, individual interviews, and observation training team interviews. These responses will be compared with the responses of A.I.D. participants from previous DETRI reports.

The data in these status reports were collected in the same manner as the data presented in the 1st and 2nd Annual Reports from DETRI to A.I.D. (May 1969, July 1970). Academic and Special program participants fill out a printed, standardized, structured questionnaire under the supervision of a person trained in its administration. They also receive an oral, unstructured interview conducted by cultural communication specialists on a private, anonymous basis. A standardized, structured questionnaire is administered orally to the members of observation training teams as a group. (Definitions of categories of participant trainees are given in the Glossary.) More detailed information on the instruments and procedures used to collect the exit interview data are included in the Final Report on the A.I.D. Participant Trainining Exit-Interview Development Study, December 1967, and the Guide for Users of the DETRI Exit

Interview, November 1970.

There is ample evidence that these data are both reliable and valid for the participants interviewed. Tests of: (1) the internal consistency of participant responses to the questionnaire, (2) interviewers' estimates of the validity of participants' responses, and (3) comparisons with results of other studies show the data to be technically acceptable. (For more detailed information see the First Annual Report, May 1969, pages iv-v.)

It is vital that the reader remember that the data presented in these reports come from participants who passed through Washington, D.C., on their return to their home countries, and who appeared at the DETRI exit interview. Participants who depart from Miami, New Orleans, and San Francisco account for losses in data, especially in the case of Latin American participants. Therefore, the information in these reports does not represent all of the A.I.D. participant trainees who departed from the United States. It does, however, represent the most systematically gathered, and most dependable data on the largest group of foreign trainees ever studied. Further, while the sample studied is not entirely representative, it is the most nearly representative sample studied and its parameters are known. The magnitude and direction of errors, therefore, can be estimated.

A presentation of all the information gathered by DETRI from the participants would be encyclopedic. For these status reports, the authors have selected some of the items which made up the criteria yardsticks (outcomes) or the factors (determinants) which were significantly correlated with the criteria yardsticks in the First and Second Annual Analytic Reports to A.I.D. A few items in these reports were chosen because of their importance for monitoring on-going A.I.D. programs for participants, even though they were not outcome or determinant items in the 2 analytic reports.

In the choice of all items, emphasis has been placed on selecting factors over which A.I.D. has some measure of administrative control.

This first status report contains data on 2688 Academic and Special participants interviewed from November 1968, through June 1970, and 146 Observation Training Teams interviewed from September 1968 through June 1970. The data in the report are presented for 2 different groupings of participants. The first grouping is of participants interviewed in Fiscal 1969 (September through June 1969), while the 2nd grouping includes participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 (July 1969 through June 1970). The Fiscal 1969 data come from 975 Academic and Special participants and from 379 participants in 62 Observation Training Teams. The Fiscal 1970 data come from 1713 Academic and Special participants and from 595 participants in 84 Observation Training Teams.

This status report has been prepared in three parts. Part I presents aggregate data on descriptive characteristics of, and the overall reactions from all Academic and Special program participants. Part II includes aggregate data for these participants on items which were found to be contributing outcomes to and determinants of their overall reactions. Part III includes aggregate data for the Observation Training Team members, including items on descriptive characteristics, overall reactions, and contributing outcomes to and determinants of their overall reactions.

Within each part of this report, there is a narrative description of the information given by participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970. Whenever the aggregate data given by these participants differs significantly* from the aggregate data

---

* "Significantly" means statistically significant. The test used was one at the "5% level of confidence." This means that the differences between the data from participants in Fiscal 1970 and Fiscal 1969 could have occurred by chance alone less than 5 out of 100 times. It is unlikely that such obtained differences are a result of chance alone. It is probable (95 out of 100 times) that the differences obtained are attributable to causal factors--although the causes may not be known.

given by the participants interviewed in Fiscal 1969 on the same items, the differences will be discussed. If there is no statistically significant difference, no mention will be made of the information gathered from participants interviewed in Fiscal 1969. For ease of access, the percentages of responses given by participants to each of the items discussed in the report will be presented in consecutively numbered tables at the end of the report.

This report was prepared by Paul R. Kimmel, William A. Lybrand, and William C. Ockey of the American Univeristy, DETRI, under Contract AID/csd-2865. The authors were ably assisted by Mary Ann Edsall, Ann Fenderson, and Roma Vaswani, also of the DETRI staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part		Page
Introduction		
Preface		i
Glossary		vi
References		vii
Change Highlights		ix
I.	Characteristics and Overall Reactions of Academic and Special Participants	
	A. Participant Characteristics	1
	B. Overall Reactions	1
II.	Contributing Outcomes and Determinants	
	A. Academic and Special Participants	3
	B. Academic Participants Only	7
	C. Special Participants Only	10
III.	Descriptive Characteristics, Outcome, and Determinant Items for Observation Training Team Members	
	A. Team Characteristics	12
	B. Overall Reactions	12
	C. Contributing Outcomes and Determinants	13
Tables		18

GLOSSARY

Academic program participant: a student who had a training program for one or more academic terms in regular curriculum courses in an accredited institution which grants an academic degree, whether or not a degree is the objective and whether or not courses are audited or taken for credit.

Special program participant: a participant whose training included one or more of the following types of training: (1) courses, seminars, or other organized programs in a specialized field which may result in the award of a certificate or diploma; (2) intensive briefings and instruction on a specific job or group of related jobs with an opportunity for close observation of the work activities, actual work experience, or both; (3) brief visits to offices, businesses, factories, government agencies, or other organizations to observe work processes and activities.

Observation training team participants: trainees who have training programs of short duration, who usually are higher level people, and who learn primarily through observation at a number of facilities usually in a number of cities or other geographic areas.

REFERENCES

A.I.D. Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State, December 1967. ARC* Catalog No. 374.013, A 512c.

A narrative report which discusses the purpose, scope and background rationale for the Exit Interview; the requirements for the Exit Interview program; the plan for developing instruments and procedures; technical considerations in constructing instruments, gathering data and recording results; and reports from DETRI to AID/OIT. (5 Appendices)

Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs: A Descriptive Statistical Report. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 512, U.S. Department of State, May 1968.

Descriptive findings from Exit Interviews conducted with 859 Academic and Special participants and 342 Observation Training Team members between July 1967 and February 1968. An overview of these participants' perceptions of, and reactions to, their entire training programs.

Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs: First Annual Report. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 512a, U.S. Department of State, May 1969.

Descriptive and analytic findings from Exit Interviews conducted with 1810 Academic and Special participants and 610 Observation Training Team members between July 1967 and September 1968. An overview of these participants' reactions to various aspects of their A.I.D. experience and an

* A.I.D. Reference Center, Room 1656 NS, AID/State Dept., Washington, D.C. 20523

examination of the relationship between key responses and training program characteristics. Includes a special intensive analysis of the principal satisfactions of Academic and Special participants. Recommendations. (One Appendix)

Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs: Second Annual Report. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 512a, U.S. Department of State, July 1970.

Descriptive and analytic findings from Exit Interviews conducted with 1384 Academic and Special participants and 503 Observation Training Team members between September 1968 and September 1969. (Same format as First Annual Report above.)

Guide for Users of the DETRI Exit Interview. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State, November 1970. ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 265f.

A narrative handbook to answer questions of those who have received Exit Interview questionnaires and reports and to reassure those who believe participant reactions imply personal criticism. A discussion of common problems raised by users of the Exit Interview with suggestions for reading individual questionnaires and using results in future programming.

CHANGE HIGHLIGHTS FROM FISCAL 1969 TO FISCAL 1970

Positive Changes

A. Academic and Special program participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970:

1. More often indicated that changes they requested in their training programs (after reaching their first training sites) were made (Tables 49 and 79).
2. Made more visits to more American families and gave higher ratings of enjoyment to these visits (Tables 32-34).
3. More often went out with mixed groups of home countrymen, Americans and other foreign visitors, and less often went out alone (Table 36).

B. Academic program participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970:

1. Less often had difficulties with their courses being unrelated to their major field (Table 54).
2. Less often had difficulty reading English (Table 61).

C. Special program participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970:

1. More often rated their training programs as suitable to their home country conditions, to their training and experience, and to their personal career plans (Tables 62-64).
2. More often felt that their personal participation in the planning of their proposed program was adequate (Table 74).
3. More often were rated by DETRI interviewers as seeing their principal training institutions as "excellent" (Table 65).

D. Observation Training Team members interviewed in Fiscal 1970:

1. More often had adequate time to make necessary arrangements prior to home country departure (Table 84).

2. More often had an opportunity to offer suggestions about their proposed training programs (Table 87).
3. More often reported that their per diem was adequate (Table 94).

Negative Changes

A. Academic and Special program participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970:

1. Less often were rated by DETRI interviewers as becoming more positive toward the United States as a society and toward the American people during their sojourns. (Were more often rated as having the same feelings toward the United States as a society and toward the American people when they were leaving the United States as when they arrived) (Tables 8 and 9).
2. Less often lived with U.S. citizens (Table 31).

B. Observation Training Team members interviewed in Fiscal 1970:

1. More often gave lower ratings to the utility of their USAID briefings, and to their satisfaction with the discussion of the final plan of their training programs (Tables 86 and 88).
2. More often gave lower ratings of satisfaction with their technical training programs (Table 82).
3. More often gave lower ratings to the utility of the oral presentations they heard in Washington, D.C., and in the field, and to the utility of their observation visits in achieving their program objectives (Tables 95, 97, and 99).
4. More often wanted to take part in additional social, cultural and recreational activities during their stay in the United States (Table 102).
5. More often reported difficulties with their housing accommodations (Table 93).

PART I

CHARACTERISTICS AND OVERALL REACTIONS OF ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS

A. Participant Characteristics

About 1 out of 3 of the Academic and Special participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 came from the Far East region. Only about 14% of these participants came from Latin America. Nearly 53% of the participants interviewed at DETRI in Fiscal 1970 were from the Near East-South Asia (NESA) or Africa (Table 1).*

Slightly more than half of the individual A.I.D. participants interviewed at DETRI in Fiscal 1970 were in Special training programs (Table 2). About 1 out of 4 of these participants studied in the field of Agriculture, while another 25% were in the field of Health and Sanitation. About 1 out of 5 participants studied education. Proportionately more of the participants were in the field of Health and Sanitation in 1970 than in 1969, and proportionately less of the participants were in the field of Transportation (Table 3).

Just over half of the individual participants were programmed only by A.I.D. The Department of Agriculture programmed the next highest percentage of participants, about 1 out of 6. No other agency handled more than 8% of the Academic and Special participants (Table 4).

B. Overall Reactions

Twenty-eight percent of the Academic and Special trainees

---

*About 35% of all A.I.D. participants departing from the United States in Fiscal 1970 were from NESA or Africa. About 26% of the departees were from the Far East, while almost 40% were from Latin America. Obviously, proportionately more of the Latin American participants did not receive exit interviews.

felt that their total experience as A.I.D. participants "could not have been better," the highest rating on a 7-point scale. Less than 10% of the participants indicated that they were not well satisfied by rating their total experience at or below the mid-point on this rating scale (Table 5).

Twenty-six percent of these trainees were extremely satisfied with their technical training programs, indicating that they "could not have been better." About 1 out of 8 participants showed much more negative feelings in rating their technical training programs at or below the mid-point on this rating scale (Table 6).

Forty-one percent of the trainees said that they were "extremely welcome, always felt accepted" in the United States. About 12% rated their welcome and acceptance in the United States at or below the mid-point on this rating scale (Table 7).

The DETRI interviewers rated the Academic and Special participants' feelings about: (1) the United States as a society; (2) the American people; and (3) A.I.D. On the first two of these ratings there were changes between participants interviewed in Fiscal 1969 and in Fiscal 1970. About half of the participants were rated as "becoming more positive" toward the United States as a society in 1970. This was a smaller percentage than were rated as becoming more positive in 1969. On the other hand, about 30% were rated as "staying the same" in their feelings toward the United States as a society, whereas only 24% received this rating in 1969 (Table 8). The same general relationship holds for the interviewers' ratings of participants feelings about the American people. About 59% of the participants became "more positive" toward the American people in 1970, while 28% "stayed the same." The figures for 1969 show that 66% became "more positive," while 21% "stayed the same" (Table 9).

Over half of the 1970 participants were rated as evaluating A.I.D. as either "excellent" (15.4%) or "good" (39.3%). About 1 out of 6 of these participants were rated as evaluating A.I.D. as "poor" (14.1%) or "terrible" (2.7%).

PART II

CONTRIBUTING OUTCOMES AND DETERMINANTS

A. Academic and Special Participants

1. Planning and Orientation.

About 50% of the 1970 participants gave high satisfaction (1 or 2) ratings to the planning of their training program in their home countries. Less than 15% gave much lower ratings of satisfaction with home country planning (below the mid-point on this satisfaction scale) (Table 11). About 60% of the participants rated their satisfaction 1 or 2 with regard to the planning of their training program in the United States. Less than 10% gave ratings below the mid-point on this scale (Table 12). About 1 out of 3 participants indicated that they disagreed with or were unclear about aspects of both their proposed and final training plans (Tables 13 and 14).

About 1 out of 9 participants were rated by the DETRI interviewers as having negative feelings about a U.S. academic degree. This is significantly more participants than had been rated as having negative feelings in 1969 (Table 15). However, the other 2 ratings in this table were not made by the interviewers in Fiscal 1969, so a total comparison is not possible in this report.

About 48% of the participants rated the orientations they had had in their home country at one of the top 2 positions on the satisfaction scale. About 58% gave these

high ratings to orientations they had had in the United States. Approximately 1 out of 3 participants were much less satisfied, rating their home country orientations at or below the mid-point on the satisfaction scale, whereas about 1 out of 5 participants gave ratings this low to their U.S. orientations (Tables 16 and 17).

2. Administrative Arrangements.

About half of the Academic and Special participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 said they were "extremely satisfied" with the communication between themselves and the U.S. government official responsible for their training. About 1 out of 8 participants showed they were much less satisfied with this communication, rating it at or below the mid-point on the scale (Table 18). Eight out of 9 participants said they had no difficulty in communicating with this government official during their training programs (Table 19).

Nearly 40% of the 1970 participants said they were "extremely satisfied" with their travel arrangements in the United States. Less than 10% of these participants rated their travel arrangements at or below the mid-point on this scale (Table 20). Eighty-three and a half percent of the participants said they had no problems with inadequate advance travel arrangements in the United States (Table 21).

Over 55% of the participants rated their satisfaction with their housing in the United States at one of the top 2 scale positions. About 1 out of 5 participants were much less satisfied, rating their housing arrangements at or below the mid-point on this satisfaction scale (Table 22). The percentage of participants saying they had some problem with housing being too far from the training facility was 22.8%; 38.1% said they had some problem with poor public transportation services where they lived; 15.9% said they had some problem with living in an undesirable neighborhood;

and 24.3% said they had some problem with inadequate facilities and equipment in their housing (Tables 23-26).

Only about 1 out of 3 participants felt that their daily living allowance at the training location where they stayed the longest was "adequate." About 1 out of 5 participants indicated that this living allowance was "not adequate" (Table 27). Slightly more than 60% of the 1970 participants said that their allowance for books and training materials was either "barely or not adequate" (Table 28).

3. Personal and Social Activities.

Slightly more than 3 out of 4 Academic and Special participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 rated the importance of their American friendships to their total experience in the United States at one of the top 2 positions on this rating scale. Less than 2% of the participants rated these friendships below the mid-point on the scale (Table 29). Over 40% of these participants indicated that they had shared their living quarters with fellow countrymen at the training location where they stayed the longest (Table 30). On the other hand, about 15% of these participants said they shared their living quarters with U.S. citizens. This is a smaller percentage than the proportion of participants interviewed in 1969 who said they shared their living quarters with U.S. citizens (Table 31).

Just over half of the 1970 participants felt that their visits to American homes were "extremely enjoyable, could not have been better." Only 7% showed much less enjoyment of these visits, rating them at or below the mid-point on this scale. Proportionately more of the 1970 participants rated their enjoyment at the highest scale position and less at the second scale position than did the participants interviewed in Fiscal 1969 (Table 32). Only about 1 out

of 10 of the participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 said they had no visits with American families in the United States. This contrasts dramatically with nearly 45% of the participants interviewed in Fiscal 1969 who said they had no such visits. About 2 out of 3 of the participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 said they visited 3 or more American families, whereas only about 1 out of 3 of the participants interviewed in Fiscal 1969 said they visited this many families. About 3 out of 4 of the 1970 participants said they made 3 or more visits to American homes in the United States, whereas only about 45% of the 1969 participants interviewed said they made this many home visits (Tables 33 and 34).

Almost 40% of the participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 found their informal social activities "extremely enjoyable." Less than 1 out of 12 expressed more negative feelings, rating their informal activities at or below the mid-point on this enjoyment scale (Table 35). About 1 out of 12 participants said they went to most informal activities alone. This is in contrast to nearly 1 out of 6 participants interviewed in Fiscal 1969 who said they went to informal activities alone. Proportionately more of the 1970 group said they went to informal activities with mixed groups including Americans, fellow-countrymen, and other foreign visitors than did the 1969 participants (Table 36). Almost 58% of the 1970 participants said they made some kind of presentation about their home country or culture to an American audience (Table 37).

When asked about general social problems they had had in the United States, 48.6% of the 1970 participants said they had some problem with insufficient time for social activities, 28.7% said they had some problem with too little information about U.S. social customs, and 62.9% said they had some problem with feeling homesick in the United

States (Tables 38-40). The DETRI interviewers felt that about 1 out of 6 participants had been discriminated against during their U.S. sojourns (Table 41).

4. Communication Seminar and Exit Interview.

About 1 out of 5 of the Academic and Special participants who attended a Special Communication Seminar felt that the ideas they learned there would be "extremely helpful" in using their training when they returned home. About 1 out of 4 participants rated the helpfulness of the Seminars at or below the mid-point on this rating scale. (Table 42).

Over 40% of the 1970 participants rated the usefulness of the Exit Interview at the highest scale position, whereas slightly less than 7% rated its utility at or below the mid-point on this scale (Table 43). Just over half of the 1970 participants felt that the Exit Interview was "very pleasant." Less than 5% gave much lower ratings to the pleasantness of the Exit Interview (at or below the mid-point on this scale) (Table 44).

B. Academic Participants Only

1. Training programs.

Twenty-eight and a half percent of the Academic participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 felt that their technical training program was "extremely suitable" to their home country conditions, 35.5% felt it was "extremely suitable" to their own training and experience, and 35.1% felt it was "extremely suitable" to their personal career plans. On

all three of these scales, less than 7% of the Academic participants rated the suitability of their technical training programs below the mid-point (Tables 45-47).

The DETRI interviewers felt that about 1 out of 3 Academic participants saw their primary training institution as "excellent." About 1 out of 7 participants were rated as viewing their institution as being "adequate," while less than 8% were rated as viewing their training institutions as either "poor" or "terrible" (Table 48). About 1 out of 5 of the 1970 Academic participants said that requests they had made for changes in their training programs after reaching their first training site had not been made. This was a smaller proportion of Academic participants who felt their requests were denied than in the 1969 group (Table 49).

Of the 1970 Academic participants who received on-the job training, 46.2% felt that it was "extremely useful." About 1 out of 8 of these participants expressed much more negative opinions, rating the utility of their on-the-job training at or below the mid-point on this scale (Table 50). Of the Academic participants who received observation training, 37.3% found it "extremely useful," while about 1 out of 7 participants rated their observation training at or below the mid-point on this scale (Table 51). Thirty-one and a half percent of the Academic participants found the courses at their principal training institution to be "extremely useful," while about 1 out of 8 of these participants gave much lower ratings to the utility of their courses (at or below the mid-point on this scale) (Table 52).

Courses being too simple was a problem for 19.6% of the 1970 Academic participants, and 25.4% of these participants said they had some problem with their courses being unrelated to their major field. This percentage is significantly smaller than the proportion of Academic participants

indicating they had a problem with unrelated courses in Fiscal 1969. For the 1970 Academic participants 28.9% had some problem with duplication of subject matter in different courses, while 33.3% said they had problems understanding their teachers' speech (Tables 53-56).

2. Special programs.

One out of 5 of the Academic participants who attended Leadership Training Programs said they were "extremely satisfied" with these Programs. Approximately the same percentage indicated they were not well satisfied, rating their Leadership Training Programs at or below the mid-point on this satisfaction scale (Table 57).

About 1 out of 6 Academic participants who attended a Pre-Academic Workshop felt that it was "extremely useful" in preparing them for their technical training program. About 1 out of 3 participants rated the utility of their Pre-Academic Workshop at or below the mid-point on this scale (Table 58).

Almost 1 out of 4 of the Academic participants who had English language training in the United States rated it as "extremely useful." About 1 out of 3 participants expressed much more negative opinions, rating the utility of their language training at or below the mid-point on this scale (Table 59). About 44% of the Academic participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 said they had some problem with making themselves understood in English in the United States, while 17% said they had some problem with reading English (Tables 60 and 61).

C. Special Program Participants Only

1. Training programs.

Of the Special participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970, 27.3% felt their technical training program was "extremely suitable" to their home country conditions; 35.1% felt that it was "extremely suitable" to their training and experience, and 35.9% felt it was "extremely suitable" to their personal career plans. On all three of these suitability ratings, less than 8% of the Special participants rated their technical training program below the middle scale position, indicating much lower suitability. Also on all 3 of these scales, the Special participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 found their technical training program to be more suitable than did the Special Program participants interviewed in Fiscal 1969 (Tables 62-64). A similar trend was found in comparing the DETRI interviewers' ratings of the Special participants' feelings about their principal training institutions. More of the Fiscal 1970 participants were rated as feeling their principal training institution was "excellent" and less were rated as seeing this institution as "poor" than were the participants interviewed in Fiscal 1969 (Table 65).

About 1 out of 3 of the 1970 Special participants who received on-the-job training rated this training as "extremely useful." Almost 15% of these participants rated their on-the-job training at or below the mid-point on this utility scale (Table 66). Thirty-one percent of the Special participants who made observation visits rated them as "extremely useful." About 1 out of 7 of these participants rated the utility of these visits much lower (at or below the mid-point on this

scale) (Table 67). Of these participants, 43.8% said they had some problem with observation visits being repetitious, while 26.5% said they had some problem with observing insignificant and/or inappropriate activities (Tables 68 and 69).

About 1 out of 3 of the Special participants who received classroom training rated it as "extremely useful," while much more negative opinions were expressed by 14.5% of these participants who rated their classroom training at or below the mid-point on this utility scale (Table 70). Courses being too simple was a problem for 29.6% of these participants, 26.5% had some problem with too little discussion, and 29.6% had some problem with too much duplication in subject matter during their classroom training (Tables 71-73).

2. Discussion of training program.

Sixty percent of the Special participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 felt that their personal participation in the planning of these programs was "adequate." This is a considerably higher proportion of the Special participants making this rating than in the Fiscal 1969 group. Conversely, proportionately more of the Fiscal 1969 Special participants felt that their personal participation was "very inadequate" (Table 74).

Almost 95% of the Special participants interviewed in Fiscal 1970 said they had a meeting with the government official in Washington responsible for their training (Table 75). Almost 23% of the Special participants said they had made requests for changes in their training program after they reached their first training site which were not made. This is proportionately less than the percentage of Special participants interviewed in Fiscal 1969 who said that their requested changes were denied (Table 76).

PART III
DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS, OUTCOME, AND DETERMINANT ITEMS FOR OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM MEMBERS*

A. Team Characteristics

More than half of the observation training teams in Fiscal 1970 came from Latin America; this was a reduction from Fiscal 1969 when nearly 2 out of 3 teams were from this region (Table 77). NESA accounted for about 30% of the teams in Fiscal 1970, a slight increase over the previous fiscal year. The Far East sent 11% of the teams, which also represented an increase. Only 2 teams in Fiscal 1970 were from Africa.

More than 4 out of 5 observation training teams in Fiscal 1970 had programs in the fields of Labor, Agriculture Public Administration, and Education (Table 78). About 32% of the teams were in labor programs; each of the other 3 fields accounted for about 17% of the teams.

The Department of Labor programmed 1/3 of the teams in Fiscal 1970, a significant increase over its total for the previous year (Table 79). The percentage of teams with no participating agency was about 70% higher than in Fiscal 1969. The Department of Agriculture and the Office of Education each accounted for a smaller percentage of the Fiscal 1970 total than in the preceding year.

Two out of 3 teams in Fiscal 1970 were composed of 6 or fewer members (Table 80). About 20% of the teams had from 7 to 12 members, while 13% had 13 or more. The largest team had 31 members.

B. Overall Reactions

Two out of 3 observation training team members in

---

* The exit interview format for Observation Training Teams was revised during Fiscal 1969. Consequently, the number of Fiscal 69 team members in some Tables is less than the total of 379.

Fiscal 1970 expressed their high satisfaction with their total experience by giving ratings of "1" and "2" on the scale shown in Table 81. The other members were less satisfied; about 1 out of 9 gave ratings of "4" and lower.

Nearly 3 out of 5 observation training team members in Fiscal 1970 were very satisfied with their technical training programs as shown by their ratings of "1" or "2" on the scale (Table 82). About 18% were not well satisfied, and gave ratings of "4" to "7". Team members in 1970, on the average, were less satisfied with their technical training program than those in 1969.

Observation training team members in Fiscal 1970 varied widely in their expression of satisfaction with the personal and social experiences afforded them during their stay in the United States (Table 83). Slightly less than 3 out of 5 were very satisfied ("1" or "2" ratings). About 25% were not well satisfied, and gave ratings of "4" and lower.

C. Contributing Outcomes and Determinants

1. Planning and Orientation

More than 3 out of 5 team members in Fiscal 1970 indicated that they had had ample time to make the necessary arrangements prior to their departure for the United States (Table 84). This represented a significant change from the preceding year when only 1 out of 3 felt that they had had sufficient time.

One-half of the team members in Fiscal 1970 were satisfied with the time their USAID briefing had been held before their departure (Table 85). The other 50% felt that the timing was not satisfactory, usually because the briefing was held too near their actual departure time.

Ratings given by observation training team members in Fiscal 1970 to the utility of their USAID briefing showed wide dispersion (Table 86). About 2 out of 5 felt that

their briefing had been very useful, and gave ratings of "1" or "2". About 35%, however, expressed their more negative feelings by ratings of "4" to "7". Team members in 1970, on the average, indicated that their USAID briefings were less useful than did members of 1969 teams.

Slightly more than 1 out of 3 team members in Fiscal 1970 indicated that they had had an opportunity to offer suggestions about their proposed training program before their departure (Table 87). In the preceding fiscal year, however, less than 1 out of 4 had a similar opportunity.

Two out of 3 team members in Fiscal 1970 were very satisfied with the discussion they had had of the final plan of their training program as shown by their ratings of "1" or "2" on the satisfaction scale (Table 88). About 20% expressed their lower satisfaction by ratings of "4" to "7". The combined average ratings of team members in Fiscal 1970 were considerably lower than the ratings of teams in the preceding fiscal year.

About 3 out of 5 team members in Fiscal 1970 indicated that they were given an opportunity to offer suggestions about the final plan of their training program (Table 89).

The majority of observation training team members who attended the orientation at the Washington International Center in Fiscal 1970 felt that it had been very useful in helping to prepare them for their experiences in the United States (Table 90). Seven out of 10 members rated the utility of the orientation at "1" or "2" on the scale.

2. Administrative Arrangements

The great majority of observation training team members whose teams were accompanied by an escort officer (Team Manager, Technical Leader) in Fiscal 1970 found the help provided by their escort to be very useful (Table 91). Three out of 4 members rated the usefulness of the help they had received at "1" on the scale.

When rated by the interviewer on a 5-point scale with the positions designated "Exceptional," "Above average," "Average," "Below average," and "Unsatisfactory," nearly 50% of the interpreters taking part in exit interviews in Fiscal 1970 were judged to be in the 2 highest categories (Table 92).

Two out of 3 team members in Fiscal 1970 indicated that they had experienced some difficulty with housing accommodations during their sojourn in the United States. This is higher than in the preceding year when 50% of the members reported having had difficulties (Table 93).

About 1 out of 4 team members in Fiscal 1970 thought that their per diem had not been adequate (Table 94). This represents a reduction from 1969 when about 40% indicated that their per diem was not adequate.

3. Training Program

Observation training team members in Fiscal 1970, for the most part, found the oral presentations in Washington, D.C., to be a very useful element of their training program (Table 95). Nearly 3 out of 5 rated the usefulness of these presentations at "1" or "2" on the scale. About 1 out of 5, however, gave ratings of "4" and lower. The ratings of team members in 1970 were generally lower for this portion of their training program than ratings given by teams in the preceding fiscal year.

Four out of 5 team members in Fiscal 1970 felt that all of the subject matter given in oral presentations in Washington, D.C., was related to their training interests (Table 96).

The majority of observation training team members in Fiscal 1970 felt that the oral presentations given in the field portion of their training program had been quite useful in accomplishing their training objectives (Table 97). Slightly more than 50% rated the usefulness at "1" or "2"

on the rating scale. However, 1 out of 5 members gave ratings of "4" and below. Ratings given by team members in 1970, on the average, were lower than in the previous fiscal year.

About 3 out of 4 team members in Fiscal 1970 felt that all of the information given in the oral presentations in the field was related to their training interests (Table 98).

Observation training team members for the most part believed that their observation visits constituted a very useful and interesting part of their training programs. In Fiscal 1970 more than 3 out of 5 rated the usefulness of these visits at "1" or "2" on the rating scale (Table 99). About 20%, however, were less satisfied as shown by their ratings of "4" and lower. Ratings given by team members in Fiscal 1970 were generally lower than in 1969.

About 50% of the team members in Fiscal 1970 felt that they had had about the right number of observation visits in the time available for their training program (Table 100). The other members were about evenly divided between those who indicated that they had had too many visits, and those who felt that they had not had enough visits. In the preceding year almost 2 out of 3 felt that they had had the right number of visits, and about 33% would like to have had more visits. Only 2% felt that they had engaged in too many visits.

4. Social Activities

Observation training team members, generally, in Fiscal 1970 had considerable opportunity to visit American families in their homes. More than 50% of the team members reported that they had made from 3 to 5 visits, while 15% had had 6 or more (Table 101).

Nearly 3 out of 4 team members in Fiscal 1970 indicated that they had not been able to take part in as many social, cultural, or recreational activities during their stay in

the United States as they would have liked (Table 102). This is a considerably higher percentage than in the preceding year when 58% of the members would have liked to engage in more of these activities.

Table 1

Q. What regions of the world were the participants from?

REGION	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Near East South Asia	29.2	283	29.0	495
Far East	33.0	319	33.1	567
Latin America	11.4	110	14.1	241
Africa	26.4	256	23.8	408
TOTAL	100.0	968	100.0	1711

Table 2

Q. How many of the participants had Academic training programs and how many had Special training programs?

TYPE OF PROGRAM	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Academic	44.8	437	47.2	808
Special	55.2	538	52.8	905
TOTAL	100.0	975	100.0	1713

Table 3

Q. In which fields did the participants receive their education and training?

FIELD OF TRAINING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Agriculture	25.0	223	25.9	393
Industry & Mining	7.4	66	7.7	116
Transportation	9.3	83	5.9	90
Labor	12.2	109	12.3	186
Health & Sanitation	21.2	189	26.7	404
Education	24.9	222	21.5	327
TOTAL	100.0	892	100.0	1516

Table 4

Q. What government agencies participated in the training programs?

AGENCY	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
A.I.D.	55.4	540	51.9	890
Agriculture	18.3	178	17.6	301
Office of Education	6.0	58	7.3	125
Public Health Service	4.2	41	5.9	101
Other	16.1	158	17.3	296
TOTAL	100.0	975	100.0	1713

Table 5

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their total experience as A.I.D. participants? (Item 162)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	27.8	271	28.0	480
2	42.8	417	44.1	756
3	22.4	218	19.0	325
4	4.6	45	6.4	110
5	1.7	16	1.6	27
6	.6	6	.5	9
7 (Not at all satisfied)	.1	1	.4	6
TOTAL	100.0	974	100.0	1713

Table 6

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their technical training program? (Items S 81 and A 84)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	24.0	233	26.0	443
2	38.2	371	40.0	683
3	23.4	227	21.3	364
4	8.4	82	7.2	123
5	3.4	33	2.9	49
6	1.5	15	1.3	22
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.0	10	1.3	22
TOTAL	100.0	971	100.0	1706

Table 7

Q. How welcome and accepted did the participants feel in the United States? (Item 143)

WELCOME/ACCEPTED SCALE	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely welcome)	37.7	363	41.0	700
2	33.9	327	30.5	520
3	16.8	162	16.6	284
4	7.7	74	7.8	133
5	2.3	22	2.0	35
6	1.1	11	1.3	22
7 (Not at all welcome)	.5	5	.8	13
TOTAL	100.0	964	100.0	1707

Table 8

Q. How did the interviewers rate the participants' feelings about the U.S. society?

FEELINGS ABOUT U.S. SOCIETY	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Became more positive	58.8	398	52.7	723
Stayed the same	23.9	162	30.4	416
Became more negative	17.3	117	16.9	232
TOTAL	100.0	677	100.0	1371

Table 9

Q. How did the interviewers rate the participants' feelings about the American people?

FEELINGS ABOUT AMERICAN PEOPLE	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Became more positive	66.1	513	58.7	843
Stayed the same	21.4	166	28.1	403
Became more negative	12.5	97	13.2	189
TOTAL	100.0	776	100.0	1435

Table 10

Q. How did the interviewers rate the participants' evaluation of A.I.D.?

EVALUATION OF A.I.D.	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Excellent	13.7	87	15.4	231
Good	38.4	244	39.3	589
Adequate	31.8	202	28.4	425
Poor	14.5	92	14.1	211
Terrible	1.6	10	2.7	41
TOTAL	100.0	635	100.0	1497

Table 11

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the planning of their training programs in their home countries? (Item 49)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	20.6	179	24.3	339
2	28.3	246	25.8	360
3	24.0	209	22.0	307
4	13.0	113	14.7	204
5	7.5	65	7.5	105
6	3.6	31	3.1	43
7 (Not at all satisfied)	3.0	26	2.6	36
TOTAL	100.0	869	100.0	1394

Table 12

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the planning of their training programs in the United States? (Item 49)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	24.2	227	25.4	412
2	31.9	300	35.0	567
3	22.3	209	20.4	331
4	11.9	112	11.3	184
5	6.2	58	4.7	77
6	2.3	22	1.8	29.
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.2	11	1.4	22
TOTAL	100.0	939	100.0	1622

Table 13

Q. At the time the participants left their home country were there any aspects of their proposed plan that they disagreed with or were unclear? (Item 26)

RESPONSE	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
No	66.7	640	68.6	1169
Yes	33.3	319	31.4	535
TOTAL	100.0	959	100.0	1704

Table 14

Q. Were there any aspects of the participants' final plan that they disagreed with or were unclear? (Item 37)

RESPONSE	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
No	67.8	651	69.6	1186
Yes	32.2	309	30.4	513
TOTAL	100.0	960	100.0	1704

Table 15

Q. How did the interviewers rate the participants' feelings about a U.S. degree?

FEELINGS ABOUT U.S. DEGREE	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
No feelings	-	-	58.3	999
Positive feelings	-	-	29.8	511
Negative feelings	6.8	66	11.9	203
TOTAL			100.0	1713

Table 16

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the orientations they had in their home country? (Item 51)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	20.1	162	23.0	312
2	24.9	200	24.7	336
3	23.0	185	22.4	305
4	15.0	121	16.1	218
5	9.2	74	7.7	105
6	4.6	37	3.9	53
7 (Not at all satisfied)	3.1	25	2.2	30
TOTAL	100.0	804	100.0	1359

Table 17

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the orientations they had in the United States? (Item 51)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	22.8	206	25.5	403
2	35.6	322	33.0	521
3	23.3	211	22.7	359
4	11.4	103	12.7	200
5	4.2	38	3.6	56
6	1.4	13	1.5	24
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.3	12	1.0	16
TOTAL	100.0	905	100.0	1579

Table 18

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their communication during their sojourn with the government official in Washington responsible for their training? (Item 57)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	46.6	450	50.1	852
2	29.5	285	26.0	443
3	12.7	123	11.9	203
4	6.4	62	6.8	115
5	2.6	25	2.1	36
6	1.1	11	1.5	26
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.1	10	1.6	27
TOTAL	100.0	966	100.0	1702

Table 19

Q. Did the participants experience any difficulties, during their training, in communicating with the U.S. government official in Washington responsible for their training? (Item 55)

HAD DIFFICULTY	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
No	87.8	851	88.8	1517
Yes	12.2	118	11.2	192
TOTAL	100.0	969	100.0	1709

Table 20

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their travel arrangements in the United States? (Item 145)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	36.2	217	39.0	666
2	34.9	209	34.7	593
3	17.4	104	17.2	293
4	7.5	45	5.9	100
5	2.8	17	2.2	37
6	.5	3	.8	14
7 (Not at all satisfied)	.7	4	.2	4
TOTAL	100.0	599	100.0	1707

Table 21

Q. Did the participants have a problem with inadequate advance arrangements for traveling? (Item 144d)

PROBLEM WITH INADEQUATE ADVANCE TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	82.0	487	83.5	1419
Some	14.6	87	12.9	219
Much	3.4	20	3.6	61
TOTAL	100.0	594	100.0	1699

Table 22

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their housing in the United States? (Item 112)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	26.0	248	27.3	467
2	33.3	317	30.7	526
3	22.5	214	21.9	376
4	10.5	100	11.6	198
5	3.3	31	4.0	69
6	2.5	24	2.7	46
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.9	18	1.8	31
TOTAL	100.0	952	100.0	1713

Table 23

Q. Did the participants have a problem with their housing being too far from their training facility? (Item 111a)

PROBLEM WITH HOUSING TOO FAR FROM TRAINING FACILITY	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	75.0	726	77.2	1319
Some	17.8	172	15.6	267
Much	7.2	70	7.2	123
TOTAL	100.0	968	100.0	1709

Table 24

Q. Did the participants have a problem with poor public transportation services from where they lived? (Item 111c)

PROBLEM WITH POOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	63.6	612	61.9	1057
Some	19.2	185	20.3	347
Much	17.2	165	17.8	303
TOTAL	100.0	962	100.0	1707

Table 25

Q. Did the participants have a problem with living in an undesirable neighborhood? (Item 111d)

PROBLEM WITH UNDESIRABLE NEIGHBORHOOD	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	85.1	817	84.1	1436
Some	10.4	100	12.2	206
Much	4.5	43	3.7	64
TOTAL	100.0	960	100.0	1706

Table 26

Q. Did the participants have a problem with inadequate facilities and equipment with their housing? (Item 111f)

PROBLEM WITH INADEQUATE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	73.8	709	75.7	1293
Some	21.8	210	20.0	341
Much	4.4	42	4.3	73
TOTAL	100.0	961	100.0	1707

Table 27

Q. How adequate were the participants' daily living allowances at the training location where they stayed the longest? (Item 148)

ADEQUACY OF LIVING ALLOWANCE	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Adequate	31.0	268	33.5	491
Barely adequate	47.4	409	44.4	652
Not adequate	21.6	187	22.1	324
TOTAL	100.0	864	100.0	1467

Table 28

Q. How adequate was the money provided for books, training materials, and other incidental technical training program expenses? (Item 151)

ADEQUACY OF TRAINING ALLOWANCE	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Adequate	38.0	366	38.6	658
Barely adequate	32.4	312	29.5	503
Not adequate	29.6	285	31.9	543
TOTAL	100.0	963	100.0	1704

Table 29

Q. How important were personal friendships with Americans to the participants' total experience in the United States? (Item 133)

IMPORTANCE OF FRIENDSHIPS	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely important)	44.0	396	45.6	719
2	33.3	299	31.8	501
3	15.5	139	16.1	254
4	5.1	46	4.9	77
5	1.3	12	.6	10
6	.3	3	.6	10
7 (Not at all important)	.5	4	.4	7
TOTAL	100.0	899	100.0	1578

Table 30

Q. Did the participants, where they lived the longest, share their living quarters with fellow countrymen? (Item 110b)

LIVED WITH FELLOW COUNTRYMEN	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	44.8	437	41.6	713
No	55.2	538	58.4	1000
TOTAL	100.0	975	100.0	1713

Table 31

Q. Did the participants, where they lived the longest, share their living quarters with U.S. citizens? (Item 110c)

LIVED WITH U.S. CITIZENS	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	23.9	233	15.4	264
No	76.1	742	84.6	1449
TOTAL	100.0	975	100.0	1713

Table 32

Q. How enjoyable were the participants' visits to American homes? (Item 123)

ENJOYMENT RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely enjoyable)	45.0	305	50.4	795
2	35.4	240	28.5	449
3	14.2	96	14.1	223
4	4.4	30	5.1	80
5	.7	5	1.3	21
6	.3	2	.3	4
7 (Not at all enjoyable)	0.0	0	.3	4
TOTAL	100.0	678	100.0	1576

Table 33

Q. Approximately how many different American families did the participants visit? (Item 120)

NUMBER OF FAMILIES	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	44.8	437	10.4	179
1	9.8	95	9.5	162
2	8.5	83	14.1	242
3-5	20.2	197	33.6	575
6 or more	16.7	163	32.4	555
TOTAL	100.0	975	100.0	1713

Table 34

Q. Approximately how many visits to American homes did the participants make? (Item 121)

NUMBER OF VISITS	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	44.4	433	10.3	176
1	6.3	61	4.4	75
2	5.3	52	8.0	137
3-5	14.4	140	25.1	430
6 or more	29.6	289	52.2	895
TOTAL	100.0	975	100.0	1713

Table 35

Q. How enjoyable were the informal activities the participants took part in? (Item 126)

ENJOYMENT RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely enjoyable)	35.3	264	38.9	659
2	40.4	302	34.7	588
3	17.9	134	18.3	311
4	4.0	30	5.7	96
5	2.0	15	1.7	29
6	.4	3	.5	8
7 (Not at all enjoyable)	0.0	0	.2	4
TOTAL	100.0	748	100.0	1695

Table 36

Q. With whom did the participants most often go to informal activities? (Item 125)

PERSON MOST OFTEN WENT WITH	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
No one, went alone	16.0	153	8.9	148
Americans	25.3	241	24.1	399
Home countrymen	24.2	231	26.4	437
Other foreign nationals	6.7	64	7.6	126
Mixed groups (some Americans, some home countrymen, and some other foreign people)	27.8	265	33.0	548
TOTAL	100.0	954	100.0	1658

Table 37

Q. Did the participants make any kind of presentation about their home country or culture to an American audience? (Item 129)

MADE PRESENTATION	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	60.5	575	57.7	980
No	39.5	375	42.3	717
TOTAL	100.0	950	100.0	1697

Table 38

Q. Did the participants have a problem with lacking sufficient time for social and recreational activities? (Item 142k)

PROBLEM WITH INSUFFICIENT TIME FOR SOCIAL ACTIVITIES	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	52.4	504	51.4	872
Some	37.8	364	37.5	635
Much	9.8	94	11.1	188
TOTAL	100.0	962	100.0	1695

Table 39

Q. Did the participants have a problem with having too little information about U.S. social customs? (Item 142g)

PROBLEM WITH TOO LITTLE INFORMATION ABOUT SOCIAL CUSTOMS	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	72.9	703	71.3	1216
Some	22.8	220	24.8	422
Much	4.3	41	3.9	66
TOTAL	100.0	964	100.0	1704

Table 40

Q. Did the participants have a problem with feeling homesick? (Item 142d)

PROBLEM WITH FEELING HOMESICK	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	34.8	335	37.1	633
Some	48.6	469	47.2	805
Much	16.6	160	15.7	268
TOTAL	100.0	964	100.0	1706

Table 41

Q. Did the interviewers feel the participants were discriminated against?

DISCRIMINATED AGAINST	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
No	80.7	593	84.0	1390
Yes	19.3	142	16.0	265
TOTAL	100.0	735	100.0	1655

Table 42

Q. How helpful did the participants think the ideas they got from the Special Communication Seminar will be in using their training when they return home? (Item 103)

HELPFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely helpful)	24.4	146	22.4	236
2	29.0	174	27.8	294
3	22.5	135	22.7	240
4	10.4	62	14.1	149
5	6.2	37	5.9	62
6	5.3	32	4.5	48
7 (Not at all helpful)	2.2	13	2.6	27
TOTAL	100.0	599	100.0	1056

Table 43

Q. How useful did the participants think the Exit Interview was for getting their evaluations of their A.I.D. training program?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '70 %	FY '70 N
1 (Extremely Useful)	44.1	824
2	33.4	624
3	15.9	298
4	5.3	100
5	.9	17
6	.3	6
7 (Not at all useful)	.1	2
TOTAL	100.0	1871

Table 44

Q. How pleasant did the participants find the Exit Interview?

PLEASANTNESS RATING	FY '70 %	FY '70 N
1 (Very Pleasant)	53.4	987
2	29.4	542
3	12.6	233
4	3.7	68
5	.3	6
6	.4	8
7 (Not at all Pleasant)	.2	3
TOTAL	100.0	1847

Table 45

Q. How suitable did the Academic participants feel their technical training program was to their home country conditions? (Item 83b)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	23.2	93	28.5	228
2	31.0	124	31.4	251
3	26.0	104	23.5	188
4	10.8	43	9.7	78
5	4.5	18	3.9	31
6	4.0	16	2.1	17
7 (Not at all suitable)	.5	2	.9	7
TOTAL	100.0	400	100.0	800

Table 46

Q. How suitable did the Academic participants feel their technical training program was to their training and experience? (Item 83a)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	30.7	123	35.5	285
2	41.9	168	38.1	306
3	15.7	63	16.7	134
4	7.0	28	6.2	50
5	3.0	12	2.1	17
6	1.0	4	.4	3
7 (Not at all suitable)	.7	3	1.0	8
TOTAL	100.0	401	100.0	803

Table 47

Q. How suitable did the Academic participants feel their technical training program was to their personal career plans? (Item 83c)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	30.5	122	35.1	281
2	31.8	127	34.8	279
3	19.5	78	16.4	131
4	8.8	35	7.0	56
5	4.7	19	4.1	33
6	2.5	10	1.2	10
7 (Not at all suitable)	2.2	9	1.4	11
TOTAL	100.0	400	100.0	801

Table 48

Q. How did the interviewers rate the participants' feelings about their principal training institution?

TRAINING INSTITUTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Excellent	32.9	110	32.8	253
Good	42.8	143	45.7	352
Adequate	19.2	64	13.6	105
Poor	4.2	14	6.6	51
Terrible	.9	3	1.3	10
TOTAL	100.0	334	100.0	771

Table 49

Q. After the Academic participants reached their first training site, did they request any changes in their training programs that were not made? (Item 81)

REQUESTED CHANGES DENIED	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
No	74.3	283	79.4	637
Yes	25.7	98	20.6	165
TOTAL	100.0	381	100.0	802

Table 50

Q. How useful to the objectives of their technical training programs did the Academic participants find the on-the-job training they received? (Item 73)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	42.6	55	46.2	104
2	38.8	50	28.4	64
3	12.4	16	12.9	29
4	4.7	6	5.8	13
5	1.5	2	4.0	9
6	0.0	0	1.8	4
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0	0	.9	2
TOTAL	100.0	129	100.0	225

Table 51

Q. How useful to the objectives of their technical training programs did the Academic participants find the observation training they received? (Item 76)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	33.3	86	37.3	157
2	36.4	94	28.7	121
3	20.6	53	20.0	84
4	6.6	17	10.7	45
5	2.3	6	1.9	8
6	.4	1	.9	4
7 (Not at all useful)	.4	1	.5	2
TOTAL	100.0	258	100.0	421

Table 52

Q. How useful to the objectives of their technical training programs did the Academic participants find the courses at their principal institution? (Item 70)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	29.1	127	31.5	253
2	40.6	177	38.9	312
3	19.3	84	17.6	141
4	7.1	31	7.5	60
5	2.3	10	2.1	17
6	1.4	6	1.9	15
7 (Not at all useful)	.2	1	.5	4
TOTAL	100.0	436	100.0	802

Table 53

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with courses being too simple? (Item 68a)

PROBLEM WITH COURSES TOO SIMPLE	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	78.7	336	80.4	643
Some	18.3	78	18.2	146
Much	3.0	13	1.4	11
TOTAL	100.0	427	100.0	800

Table 54

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with too many courses unrelated to their major field? (Item 68k)

PROBLEM WITH UNRELATED COURSES	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	68.4	292	74.6	596
Some	21.8	93	18.6	149
Much	9.8	42	6.8	54
TOTAL	100.0	427	100.0	799

Table 55

Q. Did the Academic participants have a problem with too much duplication of subject matter in different courses? (Item 68i)

PROBLEM WITH TOO MUCH DUPLICATION	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	70.3	301	71.1	569
Some	26.6	114	24.1	193
Much	3.1	13	4.8	38
TOTAL	100.0	428	100.0	800

Table 56

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with understanding teachers' or supervisors' speech? (Item 17e)

PROBLEM WITH TEACHERS' SPEECH	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	64.8	280	66.7	540
Some	31.3	135	30.7	248
Much	3.9	17	2.6	21
TOTAL	100.0	432	100.0	809

Table 57

Q. How satisfied were the Academic participants with the Leadership Training Program(s) they attended? (Item 98)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	16.8	46	19.2	93
2	35.4	97	27.7	134
3	27.0	74	30.6	148
4	12.4	34	13.0	63
5	5.1	14	5.2	25
6	2.2	6	2.7	13
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.1	3	1.6	8
TOTAL	100.0	274	100.0	484

Table 58

Q. How useful was the Pre-Academic Workshop in preparing the Academic participants for their technical training programs? (Item 93)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	18.9	31	16.7	44
2	34.1	56	23.1	61
3	23.2	38	25.8	68
4	11.0	18	15.9	42
5	4.9	8	8.3	22
6	6.1	10	5.3	14
7 (Not at all useful)	1.8	3	4.9	13
TOTAL	100.0	164	100.0	264

Table 59

Q. How useful did the Academic participants find the English language training they received in the United States? (Item 16)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	30.5	62	24.8	82
2	21.7	44	27.3	90
3	15.7	32	16.4	54
4	15.3	31	12.4	41
5	6.9	14	8.8	29
6	7.4	15	6.4	21
7 (Not at all useful)	2.5	5	3.9	13
TOTAL	100.0	203	100.0	330

Table 60

Q. Did the Academic participants have a problem with making themselves understood in English? (Item 17f)

PROBLEM WITH SPEAKING ENGLISH	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	52.2	225	56.4	455
Some	43.9	189	39.4	318
Much	3.9	17	4.2	34
TOTAL	100.0	431	100.0	807

Table 61

Q. Did the Academic participants have a problem with reading English? (Item 17h)

PROBLEM WITH READING ENGLISH	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	77.5	331	83.0	671
Some	19.9	85	16.0	129
Much	2.6	11	1.0	8
TOTAL	100.0	427	100.0	808

Table 62

Q. How suitable did the Special participants feel their technical training program was to their home country conditions? (Item 80b)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	21.1	76	27.3	247
2	28.6	103	30.8	278
3	25.3	91	23.9	216
4	13.3	48	10.9	98
5	7.8	28	4.2	38
6	3.3	12	1.7	15
7 (Not at all suitable)	.6	2	1.2	11
TOTAL	100.0	360	100.0	903

Table 63

Q. How suitable did the Special participants feel their technical training program was to their training and experience? (Item 80a)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	29.6	106	35.1	316
2	32.1	115	36.4	327
3	21.0	75	16.7	150
4	9.8	35	7.6	68
5	3.3	12	2.1	19
6	3.1	11	1.3	12
7 (Not at all suitable)	1.1	4	.8	7
TOTAL	100.0	358	100.0	899

Table 64

Q. How suitable did the Special participants feel their technical training program was to their personal career plans? (Item 80c)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	31.1	110	35.9	321
2	30.5	108	32.0	286
3	21.5	76	18.2	163
4	9.6	34	7.6	68
5	2.0	7	4.1	37
6	3.9	14	1.4	13
7 (Not at all suitable)	1.4	5	.8	7
TOTAL	100.0	354	100.0	895

Table 65

Q. How did the interviewers rate the Special participants' feelings about their principal training institution?

TRAINING INSTITUTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Excellent	23.5	60	33.4	226
Good	42.0	107	39.3	266
Adequate	18.4	47	17.5	118
Poor	13.3	34	8.0	54
Terrible	2.8	7	1.8	12
TOTAL	100.0	255	100.0	676

Table 66

Q. How useful to the objectives of their technical training program was the on-the-job training the Special participants received at their principal training facility? (Item 66)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	38.0	109	33.1	167
2	32.4	93	31.7	160
3	14.3	41	20.6	104
4	6.3	18	9.1	46
5	5.6	16	3.5	18
6	1.7	5	1.2	.6
7 (Not at all useful)	1.7	5	.8	4
TOTAL	100.0	287	100.0	505

Table 67

Q. How useful were the observation visits the Special participants made? (Item 71)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	26.5	127	31.0	233
2	37.5	180	32.6	245
3	22.7	109	22.4	169
4	8.1	39	9.6	72
5	2.7	13	2.8	21
6	1.9	9	1.2	9
7 (Not at all useful)	.6	3	.4	3
TOTAL	100.0	480	100.0	752

Table 68

Q. Did Special participants have a problem with activities at places visited too similar; too much repetition? (Item 70 b)

PROBLEM WITH OBSERVATION VISITS REPETITIOUS	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	53.1	251	56.2	420
Some	37.8	179	30.3	226
Much	9.1	43	13.5	101
TOTAL	100.0	473	100.0	747

Table 69

Q. Did Special participants have a problem with observing insignificant or inappropriate activities? (Item 70d)

PROBLEM WITH INAPPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	67.9	317	73.5	546
Some	26.3	123	21.1	157
Much	5.8	27	5.4	40
TOTAL	100.0	467	100.0	743

Table 70

Q. How useful to the objectives of their technical training programs was the classroom and related training the Special participants received at their principal institution? (Item 62)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	27.9	121	31.3	216
2	32.0	139	34.4	238
3	20.7	90	19.8	137
4	11.1	48	9.4	65
5	4.6	20	3.3	23
6	3.0	13	1.2	8
7 (Not at all useful)	.7	3	.6	4
TOTAL	100.0	434	100.0	691

Table 71

Q. Did the Special participants have a problem with their courses or presentations too simple? (Item 61a)

PROBLEM WITH PRESENTATIONS TOO SIMPLE	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	65.3	280	70.4	485
Some	27.0	116	24.2	167
Much	7.7	33	5.4	37
TOTAL	100.0	429	100.0	689

Table 72

Q. Did the Special participants have a problem with too little discussion during their classroom training? (Item 61f)

PROBLEM WITH TOO LITTLE DISCUSSION	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	75.0	318	73.5	506
Some	17.9	76	19.2	132
Much	7.1	30	7.3	50
TOTAL	100.0	424	100.0	688

Table 73

Q. Did the Special participants have a problem with too much duplication in subject matter during their classroom training? (Item 61h)

PROBLEM WITH TOO MUCH DUPLICATION	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
None	66.9	283	70.4	480
Some	26.7	113	22.0	150
Much	6.4	27	7.6	52
TOTAL	100.0	423	100.0	682

Table 74

Q. How adequate was the Special participants' personal participation in the planning of their proposed technical training programs? (Item 24)

ADEQUACY OF PARTICIPATION	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Very inadequate	21.4	59	14.8	133
Somewhat inadequate	29.3	81	25.2	227
Adequate	49.3	136	60.0	540
TOTAL	100.0	276	100.0	900

Table 75

Q. Before their technical training program began, did the Special participants have a personal meeting, or meetings, with the government official in Washington responsible for their training? (Item 30)

HAD MEETING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
No	6.1	33	5.3	48
Yes	93.9	505	94.7	856
TOTAL	100.0	538	100.0	904

Table 76

Q. After the Special participants reached their first training site, did they request any changes in their training programs that were not made? (Item 76)

REQUESTED CHANGES DENIED	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
No	70.6	235	77.1	686
Yes	29.4	98	22.9	204
TOTAL	100.0	333	100.0	890

Table 77

Q. What regions of the world were the observation training teams from?

REGION	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	Teams	%	Teams
Africa	6.5	4	2.4	2
Far East	3.2	2	10.7	9
Latin America	64.5	40	53.5	45
Near East-South Asia	22.6	14	29.8	25
Multi-Region	3.2	2	3.6	3
TOTAL	100.0	62	100.0	84

Table 78

Q. In what fields of training did the observation training teams have their training?

FIELD OF TRAINING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	Teams	%	Teams
Labor	22.6	14	32.1	27
Agriculture	21.0	13	16.7	14
Public Administration	16.1	10	16.7	14
Education	14.5	9	17.8	15
Industry & Mining	8.1	5	8.3	7
Health & Sanitation	8.1	5	1.2	1
Transportation	3.2	2	1.2	1
Other	6.4	4	6.0	5
TOTAL	100.0	62	100.0	84

Table 79

Q. What government agencies participated in the training programs?

AGENCY	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	Teams	%	Teams
Labor	22.6	14	33.3	28
Agriculture	24.2	15	13.1	11
Office of Education	16.1	10	8.3	7
Internal Revenue Service	8.1	5	10.7	9
Public Health Service	6.4	4	1.2	1
U.S. Geological Survey	3.2	2	3.6	3
A.I.D	9.7	6	16.7	14
Other	9.7	6	13.1	11
TOTAL	100.0	62	100.0	84

Table 80

Q. What was the size of the observation training teams?

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	Teams	%	Teams
1-3	37.1	23	22.6	19
4-6	22.6	14	44.0	37
7-9	21.0	13	13.1	11
10-12	11.3	7	7.2	6
13-31	8.0	5	13.1	11
TOTAL	100.0	62	100.0	84

Table 81

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their total experience as A.I.D. participants?

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	19.0	72	23.7	140
2	45.0	174	41.0	243
3	24.0	91	23.7	140
4	7.9	30	8.4	50
5	2.4	9	2.2	13
6	.7	3	.5	3
7 (Not at all satisfied)	.0	0	.5	3
TOTAL	100.0	379	100.0	592

Table 82

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their technical training programs?

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	32.0	39	26.4	157
2	39.4	48	32.8	195
3	18.0	22	22.9	136
4	4.1	5	11.8	70
5	4.9	6	3.9	23
6	1.6	2	2.0	12
7 (Not at all satisfied)	.0	0	.2	2
TOTAL	100.0	122	100.0	595

Table 83

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their personal and social experiences in the United States?

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '70	
	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	24.0	82
2	31.4	107
3	19.9	68
4	13.2	45
5	7.1	24
6	4.4	15
7 (Not at all satisifed)	0.0	0
TOTAL	100.0	341

Table 84

Q. Did the participants have adequate time to make departure arrangements?

HAD ADEQUATE TIME	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	34.4	32	62.6	308
No	65.6	61	37.4	184
TOTAL	100.0	93	100.0	492

Table 85

Q. Were the participants satisfied with the timing of their USAID briefings?

SATISFIED WITH TIMING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	52.6	30	49.6	168
No	47.4	27	50.4	171
TOTAL	100.0	57	100.0	339

Table 86

Q. How useful did the participants find the USAID briefing?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	41.3	45	20.4	102
2	16.5	18	22.8	114
3	23.9	26	22.0	110
4	10.1	11	17.4	87
5	4.6	5	13.2	66
6	.9	1	3.4	17
7 (Not at all useful)	2.8	3	.8	4
TOTAL	100.0	109	100.0	500

Table 87

Q. Did the participants have an opportunity to offer suggestions about their proposed training programs?

OPPORTUNITY TO OFFER SUGGESTIONS	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	23.5	89	35.6	212
No	76.5	290	64.4	383
TOTAL	100.0	379	100.0	595

Table 88

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their discussion of the final plan of their training programs?

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	59.8	70	41.8	193
2	16.2	19	24.5	113
3	11.1	13	14.3	66
4	5.1	6	10.8	50
5	.9	1	3.2	15
6	3.4	4	2.6	12
7 (Not at all satisfied)	3.4	4	2.8	13
TOTAL	100.0	117	100.0	462

Table 89

Q. Did the participants have an opportunity to offer suggestions about the final plan of their training programs?

OPPORTUNITY TO OFFER SUGGESTIONS	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	55.9	212	61.7	367
No	44.1	167	38.3	228
TOTAL	100.0	379	100.0	595

Table 90

Q. How useful did the participants find the Washington International Center Orientation?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	28.9	26	38.8	141
2	42.2	38	31.7	115
3	15.6	14	13.8	50
4	3.3	3	5.5	20
5	7.8	7	6.6	24
6	2.2	2	1.9	7
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0	0	1.7	6
TOTAL	100.0	90	100.0	363

Table 91

Q. How useful was the help provided by the participants' team escort officers?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '70	
	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	77.4	254
2	13.7	45
3	3.7	12
4	2.4	8
5	.6	2
6	.6	2
7 (Not at all useful)	1.5	5
TOTAL	100.0	328

Table 92

Q. What was the quality of the interpreting in the exit interview?

QUALITY OF INTERPRETING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Exceptional	3.5	2	6.7	6
Above average	36.8	21	40.0	36
Average	45.6	26	31.1	28
Below average	12.3	7	18.9	17
Unsatisfactory	1.8	1	3.3	3
TOTAL	100.0	57	100.0	90

Table 93

Q. Did the participants have any difficulties with housing?

HAD HOUSING DIFFICULTY	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	49.6	188	66.3	394
No	50.4	191	33.7	201
TOTAL	100.0	379	100.0	595

Table 94

Q. How adequate was the participants' per diem while in the United States?

ADEQUACY OF PER DIEM	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Adequate	30.1	114	40.0	237
Barely adequate	31.4	119	34.0	201
Not adequate	38.5	146	26.0	154
TOTAL	100.0	379	100.0	592

Table 95

Q. How useful were the oral presentations the participants had in Washington, D.C.?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	51.9	55	25.4	104
2	34.0	36	32.2	132
3	11.3	12	24.4	100
4	.9	1	12.7	52
5	1.9	2	4.6	19
6	0.0	0	.7	3
7 (Not at all useful	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTAL	100.0	106	100.0	410

Table 96

Q. Did the participants find all the subject matter in their Washington, D.C., presentations related to their training interests?

SUBJECT MATTER RELATED TO TRAINING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	82.1	32	80.5	293
No	17.9	7	19.5	71
TOTAL	100.0	39	100.0	364

Table 97

Q. How useful did the participants find the oral presentations they had in the field?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	23.5	19	22.4	89
2	46.9	38	30.7	122
3	19.8	16	26.2	104
4	0.0	0	14.4	57
5	7.4	6	4.0	16
6	2.5	2	2.0	8
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0	0	.3	1
TOTAL	100.0	81	100.0	397

Table 98

Q. Did the participants find all the subject matter in their field presentations related to training interests?

SUBJECT MATTER RELATED TO TRAINING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	78.9	15	73.5	255
No	21.1	4	26.5	92
TOTAL	100.0	19	100.0	347

Table 99

Q. How useful did the participants find their observation visits?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	37.6	38	28.2	156
2	38.6	39	33.2	184
3	9.9	10	19.9	110
4	3.0	3	11.6	64
5	8.9	9	5.4	30
6	2.0	2	1.4	8
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0	0	.4	2
TOTAL	100.0	101	100.0	554

Table 100

Q. How adequate was the number of observation visits the participants made?

ADEQUACY OF OBSERVATION VISITS	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Right number	64.8	57	49.8	276
Too many	2.3	2	26.5	147
Not enough	32.9	29	23.6	131
TOTAL	100.0	88	100.0	554

Table 101

Q. How many visits to American homes did the participants make?

NUMBER OF VISITS	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
1	13.4	15	12.8	70
2	7.1	8	19.5	107
3-5	61.6	69	53.0	291
6 or more	17.9	20	14.8	81
TOTAL	100.0	112	100.0	549

Table 102

Q. Did the participants take part in as many personal and social activities as they wanted?

TOOK PART IN SUFFICIENT ACTIVITIES	FY '69		FY '70	
	%	N	%	N
Yes	41.8	158	27.9	166
No	58.2	220	72.1	429
TOTAL	100.0	378	100.0	595